



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Applicant:

John M. Adams

Filed: November 25, 1998

Serial No.: 09/199,854

For: Uterine Contraction Detection and
Initiation System and Method

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Group Art Unit: 3737

Examiner: Scott Getzow

Atty. Docket No.: 018033-00001

#15
B. Webb
8/27/04

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
BOX NON-FEE AMENDMENT
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated November 9, 1999, in which a shortened statutory period for response was set to expire three (3) months later, the Applicant makes the following remarks and requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of claims 31 and 32. A petition for a three-month extension of time, with the requisite fee, is being filed concurrently herewith. The petition extends the time for filing this response to May 9, 2000.

REMARKS

Claims 1-34 remain in the application. Claims 1-30, 33, and 34 are allowed. The Examiner has rejected Claims 31 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), alleging that these claims are unpatentable over the Karsdon '526 Patent. This is incorrect. The Karsdon patent teaches that current is applied to inhibit contractions when they are present. In contrast, Claims 31 and 32 provide that one stimulates the uterus when contractions are absent.